



CASE #: TVAC.01P
Serial No.: 10/064,104
APPLICANT: Trese J. Vackar
TITLE: HAIR TRIM GUIDE

CERTIFICATE IS ATTACHED TO THE **TRANSMITTAL FORM (1 Page)** OF THE ABOVE-NAMED PATENT APPLICATION.


EXPRESS MAIL NO. EL561721963US

DATE OF DEPOSIT: August 8, 2005

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR §1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John C. Lambertsen", written over a horizontal line.

John C. Lambertsen



PTO/SB/21 (09-04)

Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

Under the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995, no persons are required to respond to a collection of information unless it displays a valid OMB control number.

**TRANSMITTAL
FORM**

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission

Application Number	10/064,104
Filing Date	June 11, 2002
First Named Inventor	Trese J. Vackar
Art Unit	3732
Examiner Name	Stephanie L. Willatt
Attorney Docket Number	TVAC.01P

ENCLOSURES (Check all that apply)

<input type="checkbox"/> Fee Transmittal Form <input type="checkbox"/> Fee Attached <input type="checkbox"/> Amendment/Reply <input type="checkbox"/> After Final <input type="checkbox"/> Affidavits/declaration(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Extension of Time Request <input type="checkbox"/> Express Abandonment Request <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement <input type="checkbox"/> Certified Copy of Priority Document(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application <input type="checkbox"/> Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53	<input type="checkbox"/> Drawing(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Licensing-related Papers <input type="checkbox"/> Petition <input type="checkbox"/> Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application <input type="checkbox"/> Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address <input type="checkbox"/> Terminal Disclaimer <input type="checkbox"/> Request for Refund <input type="checkbox"/> CD, Number of CD(s) _____ <input type="checkbox"/> Landscape Table on CD	<input type="checkbox"/> After Allowance Communication to TC <input type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Appeal Communication to TC (Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief) <input type="checkbox"/> Proprietary Information <input type="checkbox"/> Status Letter <input type="checkbox"/> Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
<input type="checkbox"/> Remarks		

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	KENEHAN & LAMBERTSEN, LTD.		
Signature			
Printed name	John C. Lambertsen		
Date	August 8, 2005	Reg. No.	29,400

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature			
Typed or printed name		Date	

This collection of information is required by 37 CFR 1.5. The information is required to obtain or retain a benefit by the public which is to file (and by the USPTO to process) an application. Confidentiality is governed by 35 U.S.C. 122 and 37 CFR 1.11 and 1.14. This collection is estimated to 2 hours to complete, including gathering, preparing, and submitting the completed application form to the USPTO. Time will vary depending upon the individual case. Any comments on the amount of time you require to complete this form and/or suggestions for reducing this burden, should be sent to the Chief Information Officer, U.S. Patent and Trademark Office, U.S. Department of Commerce, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450. DO NOT SEND FEES OR COMPLETED FORMS TO THIS ADDRESS. SEND TO: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

If you need assistance in completing the form, call 1-800-PTO-9199 and select option 2.



CASE #: TVAC.01P
Serial No.: 10/064,104
APPLICANT: Trese J. Vackar
TITLE: HAIR TRIM GUIDE

CERTIFICATE IS ATTACHED TO THE **REPLY BRIEF (5 Pages)** OF THE ABOVE-NAMED PATENT APPLICATION.

EXPRESS MAIL NO. EL561721963US

DATE OF DEPOSIT: August 8, 2005

I hereby certify that this paper or fee is being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 37 CFR §1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John C. Lambertsen", written over a horizontal line.

John C. Lambertsen



08-09-05

AF
CPW

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Serial No. : 10/064,104) Confirm. No. 9166
Appellant : Trese J. Vackar)
Filed : June 11, 2002)
TC/Art Unit : 3732)
Examiner : Stephanie L. Willatt)
Docket No. : TVAC.01P)
Cust. No. : 23732)

REPLY BRIEF

Mail Stop APPEAL BRIEF - PATENTS
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

SUMMARY OF REPLY

The EXAMINER'S ANSWER mailed June 7, 2005, demonstrates a continued insistence on converting the threaded shaft of Miller into a peg, notwithstanding the completely different fastening system underlying the Miller disclosure. The stubborn effort of the Examiner to drive a threaded shaft through a round hole is the issue underlying the "Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal."

THE ARGUMENT

The "Grounds of Rejection" set forth in the Examiner's Answer mailed on June 7, 2005, acknowledge that Benjamin (U.S. Patent No. 3,613,694) does not disclose a peg attached to the

Appellant: Trese J. Vackar
Serial No.: 10/064,104
Filed: August 8, 2005

eyeglass frame, with the Examiner relying upon Miller (U.S. Patent No. 4,106,515) to provide the missing "peg" structure. The claims on appeal implicitly require such a structure, and absent such a disclosure in Miller, the §103(a) rejections must be withdrawn.

REBUTTAL TO EXAMINER'S "RESPONSE TO ARGUMENT"

The Examiner relies upon the definition of a peg cited by Appellant ("a small cylindrical pin used to fasten things") to qualify the threaded shaft 24 of Miller as a "peg." The lack of the word or concept of "outer threads" in the relied-upon definition considerably weakens the force of the Examiner's argument.

The Examiner conveniently omits another structure when applying the teachings of Miller in the "Grounds of Rejection" - a structure that is both critical to the operation of Miller and requires the "outer threads."

Benjamin does not disclose a peg attached to the eyeglass frame and projecting therefrom. Miller discloses a peg (shaft 24) attached to a frame and projecting therefrom so that it can fit through an aperture (slit 32) of a trim guide (template 28), as discussed in column 2, lines 7-23. (EXAMINER'S ANSWER, Page 4)

Figure 2 is reproduced herein, and it is immediately apparent that the Examiner's analysis has conveniently overlooked the wing nut 38. Miller's fastening system requires both the threaded shaft 24 and the wing nut 38 to secure the vertical position of trimming template 28.




FIG. 2

The Examiner seeks to combine the above teachings of Miller with the teachings of Benjamin in the following manner:


Appellant: Trese J. Vackar
Serial No.: 10/064,104
Filed: August 8, 2005

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include a peg attached to the temple of the frame of Benjamin, as taught by Miller, and an aperture on the trim guide of Benjamin, as taught by Miller, in order to provide a means for attaching the trim guide to the temple in such a way that the trim guide does not slide laterally out of position. (EXAMINER'S ANSWER, Page 4)

As noted in Appellant's APPEAL BRIEF, there are three requirements under §2143 M.P.E.P. to establish a prima facie case of obviousness: (1) motivation to modify or combine the reference(s); (2) a reasonable expectation of success; and (3) the prior art reference(s) must teach or suggest all claim(s) limitations. The Examiner's combination fails under all three requirements.

Benjamin teaches the use of a grooming device that attaches to a pair of eyeglasses using a hook means 14. As noted therein,

It is another object of this invention to provide a grooming device as described above that may be readily attached to and removed from a pair of eyeglasses. (Column 1, Lines 33-35)



Under Benjamin's teaching, once the grooming device is unhooked, the temple piece T returns to its normal structure. Were one to modify the temple pieces as suggested by the Examiner, one or more "pegs" would remain projecting outwardly from the temple pieces while in use as eyeglasses. There can be no motivation

Appellant: Trese J. Vackar
Serial No.: 10/064,104
Filed: August 8, 2005

in Benjamin to require the use of customized eyeglasses in order to obtain that noxious result.

The aperture in Miller is slit 32, which is provided to permit easy vertical adjustability of the template 28. The Examiner proposes making such a slit in the Benjamin trim guide, its purpose stated as being a way to laterally fix the position thereof. To prevent lateral sliding would require a vertical slit, which in turn would permit vertical sliding - probably a worse result where the goal is to have consistent sideburn length. In the face of such ambiguity, one cannot have a reasonable expectation of success.

As has been noted previously, both in the APPEAL BRIEF and herein, there is no teaching in either Benjamin or Miller to utilize a peg fastening system. The relevant claim language, "a trim guide selectively *pegged* to said eyeglass frame," requires the utilization of pegs. The Examiner's assertion that the Miller threaded shaft 24 is also a "peg" ignores the other necessary component of Miller fastening system - the wing nut 38.

To contend that "fasten using a peg" also encompasses the Miller screw/nut combinations broadens the term "pegged" to meaninglessness - one that might as well include rivet fastening systems. Claim interpretation is grounded in the specification and, where helpful, dictionary meanings (see discussion of Phillips v. AWH Corp. in the APPEAL BRIEF). The Examiner has failed to point to either in support of "pegged" meaning to fasten with a threaded shaft and wing nut. One must conclude that the prior art references fail to teach or suggest this critical claim limitation.

Appellant: Trese J. Vackar
Serial No.: 10/064,104
Filed: August 8, 2005

The "requirements" under §2143 M.P.E.P. are intended to prevent the recognized temptation to make use of hindsight in the Section 103 patentability analysis. The extraordinary lengths to which the Examiner is willing to argue in order to place threads on a peg evidence the siren call of hindsight in the Examiner's analysis. As set forth herein and in Appellant's BRIEF ON APPEAL, a prima facie case of obviousness has not been made. A withdrawal of the Section 103 rejections is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Appellant has carefully reviewed the EXAMINER'S ANSWER, and has attempted to fairly and completely respond to the issues raised therein. For the reasons advanced in the foregoing argument, Appellant respectfully contends that each claim on appeal is patentable.

Since Appellant has shown in the foregoing argument and in its BRIEF ON APPEAL that the cited references do not support the rejections, reversal of all rejections is courteously solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENEHAN & LAMBERTSEN, LTD.

Dated: 8 Aug 2005

By: 

John C. Lambertsen
Registration No. 29,400
1771 E. Flamingo Road
Suite 117B
Las Vegas, NV 89119-0839
(702) 796-3476

TVAC.01P.APPLREPLY